UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,972	12/28/1999	YOJI KAMEO	0445-0275P	9431
BIRCH STEW	7590 02/06/200 ART KOLASCH & Bl	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 747			KIDWELL, MICHELE M	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 220400747		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3761	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MC	PHTM	02/06/2007	DADED	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/472,972	KAMEO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michele Kidwell	3761
The MAILING DATE of this commun Period for Reply	nication appears on the cover shee	et with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD IN WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE IN Extensions of time may be available under the provision after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum some reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUS of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, mmunication. Itatutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) y will, by statute, cause the application to become	UNICATION. ay a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ne ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <i>21 February 2006 and 17</i> .	luly 2006
	2b) ☐ This action is non-final.	<u>, 2000</u> .
3)☐ Since this application is in condition	•	natters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the pract		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-15 and 17-21</u> is/are	pending in the application	
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>2.6-10,13</u>	· · ·	om consideration
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	TO AND THE MAINTAIN	om consideration.
6) Claim(s) 1,4,5,11,12 and 21 is/are	eiected.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	-,	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restri	ction and/or election requirement	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the	no Evaminor	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are		to by the Evaminer
Applicant may not request that any obje		
		ving(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected t	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,	·
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority	documents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority		in Application No.
3. Copies of the certified copies		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action		not received.
	,	
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Intervi	ew Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/21/06. 	r PTO/SB/08) 5) 🔲 Notice	No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20061002
	• •	

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims 2, 6-10, 13-15 and 17-20 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144)

See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 11 – 12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Sasajima (GB 2 276552).

With respect to claims 1 and 21, Sasajima discloses a sanitary napkin comprising an elongate absorbent body having front and rear end portion, and an intermediate central portion(10) and a pair of left and right rear wing portions (20) disposed at longitudinally opposite left and right sides of the absorbent body, wherein a rearmost portion of each said left and right wing portions is co-extensive with a rearmost portion of said rear end portion of the elongate absorbent body, with said left and right wing portions extending to said intermediate central potion, each said left and right wing

Art Unit: 3761

portions extending laterally from said rear end portion of said elongate absorbent body such that a lateral extent of each said left and right wing portions is spaced a distance from said elongate absorbent body, said distance decreasing from said rear end portion toward said intermediate central portion of said elongate absorbent body, (figure 2), and wherein each of the left and right wing portions includes a liquid retentive wing portion absorbent core that comprises embossed absorption paper, and after 1 minute after dropping 1g of a physiological solution of sodium chloride from about 1 cm above the absorbent core under conditions of 20°C and humidity of 65%, the solution disperses to an area of the wing portion absorbent core measuring no larger than 80cm² as set forth in the abstract. The examiner contends that since the sanitary napkin of Sasajima is structurally identical to the claimed invention, that the article of Sasajima would produce the same results when tested according to the applicant's disclosure.

With respect to claim 5, see the rejection of claim 1. It would have been inherent that the sanitary napkin of Sasajima will provide the claimed test results because the structure of the sanitary napkin of Sasajima is identical to that of the claimed invention (i.e. providing a sanitary napkin with left and right side wing portion wherein each wing portion includes a liquid retentive wing portion absorbent core.

As to claim 11, Sasajima discloses a sanitary napkin wherein the wing portion absorbent core extends substantially an entire length of the sanitary napkin as set forth in figure 2.

Art Unit: 3761

With reference to claim 12, Sasajima discloses a sanitary napkin wherein each of wing portions includes a liquid permeable topsheet and a liquid impermeable backsheet with the liquid retentive wing portion absorbent core located therebetween, said liquid retentive wing portion absorbent core extending substantially an entire width of the sanitary napkin in partial overlapping relationship with the elongate absorbent body as set forth on page 17, lines 1 – 7 and in figure 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasajima (GB 2 276 552).

Regarding claim 4, see the rejection of claim 1. Additionally, Sasajima discloses the liquid retentive wing portion absorbent core being comprised of absorption paper as set forth in the abstract.

With respect to the pattern of the embossments, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the embossments of Sasajima in order to determine the most effective product since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range is within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3761

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 21, 2006 and July 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., reduced liquid diffusion of rear wing portions) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With respect to the applicant's argument that Sasajima does not provide rearwardly disposed wing portions, the examiner contends that any rearmost portion of the wing portion coextensive with any portion of the rear end portion of the elongate absorbent body will meet the claimed limitations. Further, any initial distance measured laterally outside of the absorbent body as compared to a lesser distance of the same will also meet the claimed limitations with respect to a decreasing distance.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 09/472,972

Art Unit: 3761

Page 6

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michele Kidwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tatyana Zalukaeva can be reached on 571-272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/472,972

Art Unit: 3761

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michele Kidwell Primary Examiner Art Unit 3761